

tive and the amount of the blood in the over-burdened internal organs would be diminished as the vital resistance of the tissues was increased; that catarrhs of the stomach and intestines would tend to disappear, the digestive secretions would resume their normal functioning, and the liver, adrenals, lymphatic glands, and other poison-destroying organs would again become effective; that infra-red rays would hasten the disappearance of fat by oxidation of excess tissue; that they were of great value in the treatment of organic or functional heart disease because from one-third to one-half of the entire volume of blood could be stored in the capillary system, thereby relieving the heart of its hardest work; that women experiencing trouble at menstruation would find comforting relief by using infra-red rays; that it was beneficial for abscesses or boils, angina pectoris, asthma, biliousness, bronchitis, colds, earache, felon, gangrene, stomach disturbances, heart disease, infections, insomnia, itch, kidney diseases, laryngitis, liver diseases, lumbago, muscle diseases, delayed or painful menstruation, rheumatism, sciatica, gout, neuralgia, neuritis, sinus trouble, sprains, sore throat, stiff neck, swollen glands, ulcers, and wounds, that infra-red rays were also beneficial for inflammation of the gall bladder, inflammation of the bladder, pus in the pleural cavities, hysteria, nervous diseases, inflammation of the ovaries, inflammation of the bone membranes, inflammation of veins, inflammation of the fallopian tubes, septicemia, and inflammation of joints, which representations were false and misleading.

On January 31, 1940, the claimant, the Knapp Monarch Co., having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for the purpose of relabeling in accordance with the provisions of the law.

194. Misbranding of therapeutic lamps. U. S. v. 144 Relievo Therapeutic Lamps. Decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 1479. Sample No. 77737-D.)

This device was a table model lamp equipped with an incandescent heating element. Its labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On February 8, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 144 therapeutic lamps at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 21 and December 7, 1939, from New York, N. Y., by the Kas-Kel Electric Co., Inc.; and charging that it was misbranded.

The device was alleged to be misbranded in that representations in its labeling that it would relieve pain, rheumatism, lumbago, earache, deep-seated pains, mental and physical fatigue; that its penetrating rays would relieve congestion and the healing heat would take out the sore spots; that it would produce health-giving rays; that it would penetrate the tissues and tone up the whole system, and assist in throwing off constitutional troubles; that it would invigorate the tissues, and that once the tissues were exposed to the rays nature itself would promote healing and cure by increased circulation, were false and misleading as applied to a table model lamp equipped with an incandescent heating element.

On February 16, 1940, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released to the claimant, the Kas-Kel Electric Co., Inc., under bond conditioned that it be relabeled under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

195. Misbranding of therapeutic lamps. U. S. v. 65 Therapeutic Lamps. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond for relabeling. (F. D. C. No. 1536. Sample No. 56348-D.)

This device consisted of an incandescent bulb screwed into a goose-neck table type lamp. Its labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the treatment of the conditions indicated below.

On February 27, 1940, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California filed a libel against 65 therapeutic lamps at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 16 and December 16, 1939, by the Eagle Electric Manufacturing Co. from Brooklyn, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: "No. 357 Table Type Therapeutic Lamp."

The device was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious in the treatment of abscess, colds, backache, lumbago, neuritis, neuralgia, rheumatism, all pains caused by indigestion; that

it would quickly relieve pain and discomfort of sore throat; that the light not only affected the surface but would reach the deep-seated pain affording relief in spinal or rectal irritation; and that application to the spine and back of neck would relieve the effects of mental or physical fatigue and would stop the pain of stiff neck, boils, carbuncles, ulcers and abscesses, etc., which representations were false and misleading since it was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On April 4, 1940, the Eagle Electric Manufacturing Co. having appeared as claimant, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond on condition that it be relabeled to comply with the provisions of law.

196. Misbranding of heat and light applicators. U. S. v. 5 Thermolite Heat and Light Applicators. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 1566. Sample No. 77196-D.)

This device consisted of an incandescent electric bulb inserted into a socket and equipped with a parabolic mirror reflector. Its labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On March 4, 1940, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia filed a libel against five heat and light applicators at Richmond, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 18, 1940, by H. G. McFaddin & Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded.

The device was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that it was efficacious for relief of almost any pain, sprains, bruises, neuralgia, lumbago, rheumatism, neuritis, stomach and abdominal pains, backache, constipation, headache, head and chest colds, affections of the ear, ulcerations, and burns; that it would cause colds and congestion in the head to yield readily; that an application on the spine upon retiring would usually induce slumber; that sunlight is nature's best stimulant for vitality, and that the rays of the device were "sunlike"; that it would promote the growth of hair and improve its appearance by stimulating the circulation, thus nourishing the roots in the scalp; that it was the best first aid, would relieve pain and discomfort of sore throat, laryngitis, inflamed breast, ovarian neuralgia, menstrual irregularities, cramps, etc.; that the therapeutic value of radiant heat was greatly enhanced by its combination with radiant light and would reach deep-seated pain and afford relief in spinal or renal irritation, bruises, backache, lumbago, sciatica, and many other complaints; that it would relieve nervous tension of spine and nerve centers and induce restful sleep and would relieve aching arches, earache, and head colds by its deep penetrating heat, which representations were false and misleading since the device would not be efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On May 22, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

197. Misbranding of heat and light applicator. U. S. v. 15 Heat and Light Applicators. Default decree entered. Product ordered delivered to charitable institutions. (F. D. C. No. 1485. Sample No. 86167-D.)

This device consisted of an electric lamp inserted in a socket fitted with a metal reflector. Its labeling bore false and misleading representations regarding its efficacy in the conditions indicated below.

On or about February 16, 1940, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut filed a libel against 15 heat and light applicators at New Haven, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about September 11, 1939, by the Varick Electric Manufacturing Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y.; and charging that it was misbranded. It was labeled in part: "Varicure Heat and Light Applicator."

The device was alleged to be misbranded in that its labeling bore representations that its use was effective in the treatment of abscess, backache, colds, earache, eczema, lumbago, neuritis, neuralgia, rheumatism, skin diseases, and all pains caused by congestion and poor circulation; that for the hair, sunlight is nature's best stimulant for vitality, and that the sunlike rays of the device would promote its growth and improve its appearance by stimulating the circulation, thus nourishing the hair and scalp; and that it was beneficial in the treatment of any ailment, which representations were false and misleading since the device was not efficacious for the purposes recommended.

On April 26, 1940, no claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering distribution of the article to charitable institutions and destruction of the circulars which accompanied it.